arXiv:hep-ph/0211013v1 1 Nov 2002

DFTT 35/02
October 2002

On power corrections to event shapes[1]

Lorenzo Magnea[2]
Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica, Università di Torino
and INFN, Sezione di Torino,
Via P. Giuria 1, I–10125 Torino, Italy

Abstract

Recent work on the theme of power corrections in perturbative QCD is briefly reviewed, with an emphasis on event shapes in e^+e^- annihilation. The factorization of soft gluon effects is the main tool: it leads to resummation, and thus highlights the limitations of perturbation theory, pointing to nonperturbative corrections whose size can be estimated. Power corrections can be resummed into shape functions, for which QCD–based models are available. Theoretical progress is closing in on the nonperturbative frontier.

[1]Invited talk at the XIV Italian Meeting on High Energy Physics, Parma, April 2002.
[2]e-mail: magnea@to.infn.it

1 Introduction

It has been known since the early days of QCD [1] that the perturbative expansion for IR safe observables is at best asymptotic, and in fact not even Borel summable. This is good news: it would be very surprising if perturbation theory alone could give a well–defined answer in a theory such as QCD, where nonperturbative phenomena govern the spectrum of physical states; an ambiguity in the perturbative answer tells us that confinement physics must, at some level, be present and relevant. Under the mild assumption that QCD is a consistent theory, we can do more: gauging the size of the uncertainty in the perturbative answer, we can estimate the impact of the dominant nonperturbative effects.

The basic tools for this analysis are the factorization and the resummation of soft gluon effects. Soft gluon emission has a universal character, and factorizes from the hard part of scattering amplitudes and cross sections; factorization in turn implies that the dominant (logarithmic) contribution of soft gluons can be computed to all orders. These computations display explicitly the asymptotic nature of the perturbative series and can be used to study power–suppressed corrections.

Studies of power corrections with perturbative methods have generated a vast literature in the past several years [2], and have reached an impressive degree of phenomenological success. In this short review I will focus mostly on theoretical results obtained for event shapes in e^+e^- annihilation, trying to put them in the perspective of the most recent developments.

2 Perturbative windows on power corrections

QCD resummations typically yield expressions of the general form

$$f_a(q^2) = \int_0^{q^2} \frac{dk^2}{k^2} (k^2)^a \alpha_s(k^2) \ . \tag{1}$$

Such expressions are ill–defined in perturbative QCD, because of the Landau pole in the running coupling at $k^2 = \Lambda^2$. Expanding in powers of $\alpha_s(q^2)$, one finds that the coefficients of the expansion grow factorially. The size of the ambiguity in the result can be gauged by taking the residue of the pole: one finds that it is suppressed by a power of the hard scale, $\delta f_a / f_a \propto (\Lambda^2/q^2)^a$.

A classic example [2] is the resummation of fermion bubble insertions into a gluon line. Let $\Pi(k^2)$ denote the fermionic part of the gluon vacuum polarization, and let $\sigma(x)$ be a generic (possibly weighted) cross section depending on some kinematic variable x. Summing over insertions of Π in the single gluon contribution to σ gives an expression of the form

$$\sigma(x) = \int \frac{dk^2}{k^2} \frac{1}{|1+\Pi(k^2)|^2} \widehat{\sigma}\left(x, \frac{k^2}{q^2}\right) \ , \tag{2}$$

where $\widehat{\sigma}$ is the virtuality distribution of the emitted gluon. If the n_f dependence of the answer is reinterpreted as the abelian contribution to the running of the coupling, Eq. (2) displays the Landau pole in the integration over gluon virtuality.

The resummation of multiple soft gluon emission near the boundary of phase space leads to similar conclusions. Consider, for example, the Laplace transform of the thrust distribution [3]. It can be shown to exponentiate in the form

$$\int_0^1 dt \, \mathrm{e}^{-\nu t} \frac{d\sigma}{dt} = \mathrm{e}^{-S(\nu,Q)} \, , \tag{3}$$

where the function S contains all the singular logarithmic dependence on $t = 1 - T$, and can be written (to NLL accuracy) as

$$S(\nu, Q) = \int_0^1 \frac{d\alpha}{\alpha} \, \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\nu\alpha}\right) \left[\int_{\alpha^2 q^2}^{\alpha q^2} \frac{dk_\perp^2}{k_\perp^2} \, \Gamma\left(\alpha_s(k_\perp^2)\right) + B\left(\alpha_s(\alpha q^2)\right) \right] \tag{4}$$

In this case the Landau pole obstructs the integration over transverse momentum.

A variety of regularizations for the Landau singularity have been proposed, (IR cutoff [4], principal value prescription [5], regular IR continuation of the running coupling [6], dimensional regularization [7], choice of contour in the inverse Laplace transform [8]). As far as the parametric size of the power corrections (*i.e.* the power of q with which they scale) is concerned, all these prescriptions (sometimes after some debate) lead to the same conclusion. They may differ when more detailed prediction are attempted.

A benchmark to verify the reliability of the methods based on different resummations is the application to observables for which nonperturbative information is available through other means, typically because of the applicability of the OPE. Along these lines resummation and OPE methods have been shown to give compatible results for the size of the correction in all

tested cases (ranging from the beautiful results of David [9] on the nonlinear σ model in $d = 2$, to the classic analysis of the total annihilation cross section by Mueller [10], to the more recent results on deep inelastic structure functions [11]). Making more detailed predictions, going beyond the identification of the leading power correction, it is necessary to rely upon the assumption of *ultraviolet dominance* [12]. To introduce the idea, consider the OPE for an inclusive cross section, say a DIS structure function in Mellin space

$$\begin{aligned} F_a(N,q^2) &= C^i_{2,a}(N,\mu_f,q^2)\langle O^{(2)}_i(N,\mu_f)\rangle \\ &+ \frac{1}{q^2}C^i_{4,a}(N,\mu_f,q^2)\langle O^{(4)}_i(N,\mu_f)\rangle + \dots \ . \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Here the factorization scale μ_f is an IR cutoff for the coefficient functions C_i, but it is an ultraviolet cutoff for the operator matrix elements. Physical quantities must not depend on μ_f, and in fact the cancellation of the *logarithmic* dependence on μ_f, *within* a given twist, is enforced by Altarelli–Parisi equations. One observes, however, that the coefficient functions C_i have an ambiguous power dependence on μ_f, of IR origin, due to the divergence of their perturbative expansion. At the same time, higher twist operator matrix elements have power–like UV divergences, so that they mix under renormalization with lower twist operators. These two facts make the twist separation ambiguous, and the ambiguity can only be disentangled once the same regularization prescription is chosen for both C_i and $\langle O_i\rangle$. What renormalon models and resummations are trying to do is to predict the exact dependence of higher twist operator matrix elements on kinematical variables (such as N above), based on their renormalization properties, *i.e.* on their UV behavior. These prediction will be correct to the extent that the matrix elements are "UV dominated". Evidence supporting the idea of UV dominance has recently been presented [11] in the case of DIS structure functions, in the elastic limit $x \to 1$. In that limit matrix elements of operators of twist 4 and 6 are dominated by parton configurations mimicking twist 2, so one can explicitly verify that the N dependence of the perturbative ambiguity at twist 2 (and large N) is in fact cancelled by the corresponding ambiguity of the higher–twist operator matrix elements.

To go beyond the OPE, it is necessary to either rely upon renormalon models, or to take the viewpoint suggested by the factorization properties underlying soft gluon resummations. In the following, I will use factorization to define a way to parametrize power corrections to event shapes (the

shape function), following [13]; starting from this general parametrization it is possible to recover the results of renormalon calculus, which in turn can be viewed as a QCD–motivated model for the shape function.

3 Two–jet limit and shape functions

Generic IR safe observables in production processes cannot be described with the OPE: they are *weighted cross sections*. Specifically, consider the distribution of an event shape e, chosen so that the two–jet limit correspond to $e \to 0$ (for example, $e = 1 - T, C, \rho_J, \ldots$). If the explicit expression for e in terms of the momenta of final state particles is $e = E_m(p_1, \ldots, p_m)$, one defines

$$\frac{d\sigma}{de} = \frac{1}{2q^2} \sum_m \int d\mathrm{LIPS}_m \; \overline{|\mathcal{M}_m|^2} \; \delta\left(e - E_m(p_1, \ldots, p_m)\right) \;, \tag{6}$$

as well as the 'radiation function', $R(e) \equiv \int_0^e de' d\sigma/de'$.

Soft gluon effects dominate the cross section in the two–jet region. Final state gluons are forced to be either soft, or collinear to the two back–to–back jets; as a consequence, the distribution factorizes under a Laplace (or Mellin) transform, schematically as $\sigma(e, q^2) = J_1(q^2 e) * J_2(q^2 e) * S(q^2 e^2) * H(q^2)$. There are, in fact, two relevant mass scales in the $e \to 0$ limit: the squared invariant mass of the jets, which vanishes as $q^2 e$, and the (squared) total energy carried by soft gluons, which vanishes as $q^2 e^2$. The factorization is valid, within perturbation theory and for $e \to 0$, in the range $q^2 >> q^2 e >> q^2 e^2 >> \Lambda^2$. If we assume that we can rely upon the same factorization in the extended range $q^2 >> q^2 e >> q^2 e^2 \sim \Lambda^2$, we can use the perturbative results to parametrize power corrections of the type $(\Lambda/(qe))^p$.

Physically, the picture emerging from factorization is equivalent to the phenomenological 'tube model' [14]: neglecting inverse powers of $q^2 e$, one observes that jet masses are insensitive to the transverse components of soft gluon momenta, and are linearly shifted by an amount proportional to the total light–cone momentum carried by soft gluons,

$$M_i^2\Big|_{NP} = M_i^2\Big|_{PT} + \epsilon_i q \;, \tag{7}$$

where i labels the two jets and ϵ_i is the sum of soft gluon momentum components along the i-th jet direction. At least for event shapes vanishing with

M_i^2, the effect of soft gluons on the perturbative distribution will take the form of a convolution in the light–cone components ϵ_i. Introducing an IR cutoff μ, one writes

$$R(e) = \int_0^\mu d\epsilon_1 d\epsilon_2 f(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) R_{PT}(e) \Big|_{M_i^2 \to M_i^2 + \epsilon_i q} , \tag{8}$$

where $f(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$ is the most general form of the announced shape function. Note that it does not depend on the hard scale q. For shape variables such as C or t, which depend only on the sum of two jet masses in the two–jet limit, one can simplify the convolution by introducing

$$f(\epsilon) = \int_0^\mu d\epsilon_1 d\epsilon_2 f(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) \delta(\epsilon - \epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2) . \tag{9}$$

Factorization further provides an explicit, if formal, operator expression for the shape function f. In the limit we are considering, in fact, soft gluon emission is well approximated by replacing the two back–to–back jets by eikonal lines. One can then treat the joint distribution of $\epsilon_{1,2}$ as a generic event shape, according to Eq. (6), but replacing the matrix element $\mathcal{M}_m$ with its eikonal counterpart. Essentially

$$f(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) = \frac{1}{2q^2} \sum_m \int d\mathrm{LIPS}_m^{\mathrm{eik}} \, \overline{|\mathcal{M}_m^{\mathrm{eik}}|^2} \delta\left(\epsilon_1 - k_1^{\mathrm{soft}}\right) \delta\left(\epsilon_2 - k_2^{\mathrm{soft}}\right) , \tag{10}$$

where $d\mathrm{LIPS}_m^{\mathrm{eik}}$ is the m–particle phase space with fixed eikonal lines, and k_i^{soft} is the total soft gluon light–cone momentum flowing into hemisphere i. Such eikonal cross sections are matrix elements of Wilson lines, so the shape function can ultimately be expressed in terms of correlators of the energy–momentum tensor at large distances, in the presence of eikonal sources.

To compare the results of this approach with renormalon calculations, it is useful to see how the shape function emerges from a resummed perturbative calculation. Consider the expression for thrust, Eq. (4). There, small t is associated with large ν, and the dominant contributions to the integral arise from the region $\alpha \sim 1/\nu \sim t$. The leading power corrections that we are trying to resum are then related to the IR behavior of the coupling through the cusp anomalous dimension Γ, and one can isolate them by interchanging the order of integration, and introducing a transverse momentum cutoff. One defines

$$S_{NP}(\nu/q, \mu) \;=\; \int_0^{\mu^2} \frac{dk_\perp^2}{k_\perp^2} \Gamma\left(\alpha_s(k_\perp^2)\right) \int_{k_\perp^2/q^2}^{k_\perp/q} \frac{d\alpha}{\alpha} \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-\nu\alpha}\right)$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \left(\frac{\nu}{q}\right)^n \lambda_n(\mu^2) \ , \tag{11}$$

where terms suppressed by powers of ν/q^2 have been neglected and

$$\lambda_n(\mu^2) = \frac{1}{n} \int_0^{\mu^2} dk_\perp^2 k_\perp^{n-2} \Gamma\left(\alpha_s(k_\perp^2)\right) \tag{12}$$

are an infinite set of dimensionful nonperturbative parameters, controlling power corrections of decreasing size, but always of the desired form $1/(tq)^n$. They can be organized into a shape function via a Laplace transform

$$\exp\left(-S_{NP}(\nu/q,\mu)\right) \equiv \int_0^\infty d\epsilon \mathrm{e}^{-\nu\epsilon/q} f_t(\epsilon,\mu) \ . \tag{13}$$

Within this perturbative framework, it is easy to make contact with the dispersive approach [6], whose results are recovered at leading power. Specifically,

- the dispersive approach predicts *moments* of event shapes in terms of a single nonperturbative parameter α_0. This parameter is equivalent (in fact, in a suitable factorization scheme, proportional) to λ_1. From the point of view of the shape function, one can show that the parameters λ_n with $n > 1$ contribute to power corrections to moments only at the level of subleading corrections, $1/q^p$ with $p > 1$. Power corrections for the moments of the distribution are then, in fact, well approximated by retaining only λ_1: it is only in the deep nonperturbative regime $e \sim \Lambda/q$ that subleading power corrections play a significant role. It is interesting to note [15] that within the dispersive approach central moments (such as $\Delta^2 t = \langle t^2 \rangle - \langle t \rangle^2$) receive no leading power corrections, whereas these are nonvanishing in shape function fits.

- In the dispersive approach one needs to include a correction accounting for the *correlations* between emissions in different hemispheres [16, 12, 17, 18]. The shape function accounts for this effect by a lack of factorizability: if one writes $f(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2) = g(\epsilon_1)g(\epsilon_2) + \delta f(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)$, the δf term is responsible for correlations. Clearly, renormalon calculations provide a model estimate of this effect, whereas from the point of view of the shape function this will emerge as a result of fits to data.

- Tube and renormalon models predict that the leading power correction shifts event shape *distributions* by an amount proportional to the energy carried by soft gluons. This prediction is recovered by the shape function, which introduces additional smearing due to subleading power corrections, as easily seen by using eq. 13, and as described in detail in Ref. [13].

4 Dressed gluon exponentiation

It is clearly desirable to merge the information that can be extracted from soft gluon resummation (which expresses the dynamical effects of perturbative multiple soft gluon emission) with the results of the dispersive approach (which models the effects of nonperturbative single gluon emission). This merging is achieved [19] by the method of dressed gluon exponentiation (DGE).

To summarize the main features of the method, pick as a shape variable a jet mass ρ. Schematically, one proceeds as follows [20].

- The first step is the computation of the characteristic function of the dispersive method (that is, the differential cross section for the emission of a gluon with virtuality k^2) for the observable at hand, in the Sudakov limit. In this limit, one retains only terms that are singular as $\rho \to 0$ when $k^2/(\rho q^2)$ is kept finite, as these are the only terms contributing to the Sudakov logarithms in the two–jet limit. For the jet mass one finds, setting $\xi \equiv k^2/q^2$,

$$\dot{\mathcal{F}}(\rho,\xi)\Big|_{\log} = \frac{2}{\rho} - \frac{\xi}{\rho^2} - \frac{\xi^2}{\rho^3} \ . \tag{14}$$

- Within the dispersive approach, the characteristic function must be integrated over virtuality with a weight given by the running coupling. Here one encounters the Landau pole. One possibility to define the integration is to turn to a Borel representation of the coupling [21]. In the present case, to achieve NLL accuracy it is crucial to define the coupling so that it satisfies Altarelli– Parisi evolution at NLO, at least for the singular contributions near threshold. This is the "gluon bremsstrahlung" coupling [22]. Performing the integration over gluon

virtuality, the result for the distribution is of the form

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\rho} = \frac{C_F}{2\beta_0}\int_0^\infty du B(u,\rho)\exp\left(-u\ln(q^2/\bar{\Lambda}^2)\right)\frac{\sin\pi u}{\pi u}\bar{A}_B(u)\ . \qquad (15)$$

Here $\bar{A}_B(u)$ is the Borel transform of the chosen coupling, the factor $\sin\pi u/(\pi u)$ arises from having taken the timelike discontinuity of the coupling, as prescribed by the dispersive method, and $B(u,\rho)$ is the Borel function obtained by integrating Eq. (14) over virtuality with the appropriate weight.

- The key step to tie this single gluon result to resummation is to use the dressed gluon distribution as kernel of exponentiation. One writes the Laplace transform of the jet mass distribution as

$$\ln J(\nu,q) = \int_0^1 \frac{d\sigma}{d\rho}\left(e^{-\nu\rho}-1\right)d\rho\ , \qquad (16)$$

and substitutes in this expression the single dressed gluon result, given by Eq. (15).

- At this point, the Borel representation of the exponent suggests a pattern of exponentiated power corrections. The integral transform associated with the exponentiation turns the simple pole structure of the one–loop Borel function $B(u,\rho)$ into a much richer one for the transformed function $\tilde{B}(u,\nu)$. One can use this structure to model the pattern of power corrections. The radiation function can be reconstructed by inverting the Laplace transform, using

$$R(\rho) = \int_C \frac{d\nu}{2\pi i\nu}\exp\left[\nu\rho + \ln J^{\rm PT}(\nu,q) + \ln J^{\rm NP}(\nu,q)\right]\ , \qquad (17)$$

with a nonperturbative contribution

$$\ln J^{\rm NP}(\nu,q) = -\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\widehat{\lambda}_n\frac{1}{n!}\left(\frac{\nu\Lambda}{q}\right)^n\ , \qquad (18)$$

In this approach, $\widehat{\lambda}_n$ are still free parameters, however the structure of the Borel transform may fix relations between them, or other general properties. For example, in the case of the jet mass ρ one is led to conclude that $\widehat{\lambda}_{2k}=0$.

- These results can again be interpreted in terms of a shape function, writing $J^{\rm NP}(\nu, q)$ as in Eq. (13). Now however the structure of the moments is derived from the Borel representation.

Dressed gluon exponentiation provides a useful tool to merge the predictions of soft gluon resummation with a parametrization of power corrections dictated by renormalons. The results of resummation are reproduced to NLL accuracy, but further predictions are made: in fact, the size of all subleading perturbative logarithms is predicted in the large n_f limit, and found to grow factorially. This fact, perhaps not unexpected, in view of the renormalon singularities of the original resummed expression, sets limits on the validity of resummations performed in terms of successive towers of logarithms, and provides an independent tool to estimate the range in which they are applicable. As far as power corrections are concerned, DGE shows that in the two–jet limit at least a class of them exponentiates together with Sudakov logarithms. Further, DGE provides a definite regularization prescription to handle resummed perturbative expressions at power accuracy, which may be useful to check the assumption of ultraviolet dominance whenever the explicit operator form of power suppressed contributions is known, as was done for DIS in Ref. [11]. Finally, as announced, renormalons make specific predictions on the structure of the shape function for a given observable, which in principle can be tested against data.

5 Phenomenology

The shape function approach and DGE were applied to selected event shapes in [15] and [20]. For lack of space, I must refer the reader to the original papers for details, however some observations are in order.

First of all, as pointed out above, DGE puts constraints on the form of the shape function, which may depend on how renormalon calculus is implemented. For example, Korchemsky and Tafat, in Ref. [15], include in their fit the effect of correlations between hemispheres by picking a gaussian ansatz for the shape function with a non–factorizable term; this term is found to be important for the fit. Gardi and Rathsman [20], on the other hand, do not include in their analysis the two–loop correction responsible for correlations within the dispersive approach, and argue that its contribution should be negligible. Such differences are perhaps difficult to settle when

working with multiparameter fits, however it seems that a more extensive comparison with data for different event shapes should settle this issue.

A second important point is the fact that if the strong coupling $\alpha_s(M_z)$ is also included as a fit parameter, the results point to a value which is rather low with respect to the world average (typically $\alpha_s(M_z) \sim 0.110$). This should perhaps be considered as a cause of moderate concern: it could mean that the current expressions for the shape function are not fully adequate to describe the effect of power corrections in the peak region (and thus they pull the fit towards lower values of α_s), or it could imply that current assumptions about the theoretical error to be associated with $\alpha_s(M_z)$ underestimate the effect of higher order and power corrections.

A final observation of considerable relevance for phenomenology was made by Salam and Wicke [23], and it concerns the relationship between the theoretical calculations described so far and experimental data. Briefly stated, the point is that while all models of power corrections are derived in massless QCD, event shapes are measured using the massive particles produced by hadronization. Salam and Wicke observed that the difference between massless and massive definitions of event shapes induces non–universal power corrections of the same parametric size (Λ/q) as conventional ones. To disentangle these mass effects from the universal features of soft gluon emission, for example when fitting nonperturbative parameters, it is necessary to specify a scheme to connect massless QCD computations and measured event shapes. The procedure followed this far, which ignores mass effects in the definition of events shapes, also constitutes a possible scheme; in this scheme, however, different event shapes are treated differently, and non–universal, mass–related power corrections should be fitted separately for different observables. Other schemes have been proposed: notably, the "E–scheme" uses measured energies E_i in the definition of the event shape, and rescales three–momenta by E_i/p_i; in this scheme, three–momentum is not conserved, however it can be shown that non–universal power corrections vanish in a tube model calculation. Another interesting possibility is the "decay scheme", in which all measured particles are forced to decay into massless particles via a Monte Carlo interface; not all decays are strong, nor realistic, however the method is interesting because it begins to address in some detail the issue of possible double countings, which arises when parton–level, QCD–based predictions for power corrections are used in conjunction with other hadronization models such as those implemented in Monte Carlo evolution codes.

Mass–related power corrections of the type described in Ref. [23] are

further logarithmically enhanced by effects related to hadron multiplicity in the final state. Model calculations using the hypothesis of local parton–hadron duality suggest

$$\delta_m\langle e\rangle = c_e\frac{\Lambda}{q}\left(\log\frac{q}{\Lambda}\right)^A \;\; ; \quad A = \frac{4N_c}{b_0} \sim 1.6 \; , \tag{19}$$

where $\delta_m\langle e\rangle$ is the non–universal power correction to the average of event shape e, and c_e a fitted coefficient. It should be noted that conventional power corrections will also generically be enhanced by logarithms, however not much attention has so far been devoted to study their effects.

6 Perspectives

After more than two decades of studies, event shape distributions remain at the forefront of theoretical and experimental QCD analyses. In a single graph, a typical distribution takes us from a completely perturbative regime ($e \sim 1$), where, at least at high energy, fixed order calculations apply, to a region dominated by nonperturbative effects ($e \sim \Lambda/q$), where all power corrections become important. Successive improvements in our theoretical tools are leading to a QCD–based understanding of the entire distribution, including the peak region dominated by two–jet configurations.

Resummed QCD amplitudes point beyond perturbation theory, and the effects of nonpertubative corrections can be conveniently parametrized by a new class of nonperturbative functions, the shape functions, which provide a general framework for studies of power corrections. Like parton distributions, they must be fitted from data, however different QCD–motivated models suggest somewhat different functional forms [20, 24]. The results of the dispersive approach are recovered, and the universality of the leading power corrections placed in a wider perspective. Renormalon calculus can be merged with Sudakov resummation via dressed gluon exponentiation, providing a model for the shape function. Hadronization effects generate mass–related, log–enhanced power corrections which must be separately understood: a defining scheme for event shapes must be chosen before a detailed phenomenological analysis is attempted.

Looking to the future, much work still needs to be completed to further refine our theoretical understanding. At fixed order, studies of event shapes at NNLO are just beyond the horizon [25]; in due course, they will be

supplemented by NNL resummation of Sudakov logarithms [26]. The shape function viewpoint could be extended in several directions: to more general event shapes in annihilation processes, which require special treatment within the dispersive approach, such as jet broadening [27], energy–energy correlations [28] and the D parameter [29]; to other processes, such as DIS, where much is known already about resummed event shapes, though it was not covered here because of lack of space [30]; ultimately, to the more general and interesting case of QCD hard scattering. Dressed gluon exponentiation cannot presumably be extended beyond NLL accuracy without tackling the issue of double renormalon chains, in itself a question of some theoretical interest. In summary, many interesting questions remain open, and our understanding of the interface between perturbative and nonperturbative QCD is likely to become deeper in the coming years.

As for experiment, this being a brief review form a theoretical viewpoint, I did not discuss data (see, for example, Ref. [31]). It should however be emphasized that one of the main reasons for theoretical interest in this area is the remarkable wealth and precision of the data available, over a wide kinematic range and for different processes. The precision of the data is such that they may well be able to discriminate between different current theoretical models of power corrections in the peak region. As the work of LEP collaborations appears to be winding down, it is perhaps worth stating once more the obvious: it is very important that data and the tools for their analysis should be preserved in usable form long beyond the lifetime of the experiments. New theoretical tools that warrant further data analysis may yet be developed, and good experimental work done in the past should not be lost.

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank E. Gardi and G. Korchemsky for helpful comments.

References

[1] G. 't Hooft, *Lectures* at the Int. School of Subnuclear Physics, Erice, 1977, in *Erice Subnucl.* **15** (1977) 943.

[2] M. Beneke, *Phys. Rept.* **317** (1999) 1, hep-ph/9807443.

[3] S. Catani, L. Trentadue, G. Turnock and B. Webber, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 407** (1993) 3.

[4] J.C. Collins and D.E. Soper, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 193** (1981) 381 [Err.–*ibid* **B 213** (1983) 545]; *Nucl. Phys.* **B 197** (1982) 446.

[5] H. Contopanagos and G. Sterman, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 419** (1994) 77, hep-ph/9310313; E. Gardi and J. Rathsman, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 609** (2001) 123, hep-ph/0103217.

[6] Yu.L. Dokshitzer, G. Marchesini and B. Webber, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 469** (1996) 93, hep-ph/9512336.

[7] L. Magnea, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 593** (2001) 269, hep-ph/0006255, and hep-ph/0109168.

[8] S. Catani, M.L. Mangano, P. Nason and L. Trentadue, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 478** (1996) 273, hep-ph/9604351; E. Laenen, G. Sterman and W. Vogelsang, *Phys. Rev.* **D 63** (2001) 114018, hep-ph/0010080.

[9] F. David, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 209** (1982) 433.

[10] A.H. Mueller, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 250** (1985) 327.

[11] E. Gardi, G.P. Korchemsky, D.A. Ross and S. Tafat, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 636** (2002) 385, hep-ph/0203161.

[12] M. Beneke, V. Braun and L. Magnea, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 497** (1997) 297, hep-ph/9701309 and *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **54 A** (1997) 183, hep-ph/9609266.

[13] G.P. Korchemsky, hep-ph/9806537; G. Sterman and G.P. Korchemsky, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 555** (1999) 335, hep-ph/9902341.

[14] B. Webber, hep-ph/9411384.

[15] G.P. Korchemsky and S. Tafat, hep-ph/0007005, *JHEP* **0010** (2000) 010.

[16] P. Nason and M.H. Seymour, hep-ph/9506317, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 454** (1995) 291.

[17] Y.L. Dokshitzer, A. Lucenti, G. Marchesini and G.P. Salam *Nucl. Phys.* **B 511** (1998) 396, [Err.–*ibid* **B 593** (2001) 729], hep-ph/9707532; *JHEP* **9805** (1998) 003 hep-ph/9802381.

[18] M. Dasgupta, L. Magnea and G. Smye, *JHEP* **9911** (1999) 025, hep-ph/9911316.

[19] E. Gardi, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 622** (2002) 365, hep-ph/0108222.

[20] E. Gardi and J. Rathsman, hep-ph/0103217, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 609** (2001) 123; *Nucl. Phys.* **B 638** (2002) 243, hep-ph/0201019.

[21] M. Beneke, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 405** (1993) 424; G. Grunberg, *Phys. Lett.* **B 304** (1993) 183.

[22] S. Catani, B.R. Webber and G. Marchesini, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 349** (1991) 635.

[23] G.P. Salam and D. Wicke, *JHEP* **0105** (2001) 061, hep-ph/0102343.

[24] A.V. Belitsky, G.P. Korchemsky and G. Sterman, *Phys. Lett.* **B 515** (2001) 297, hep-ph/0106308.

[25] L.W. Garland, T. Gehrmann, E.W. Glover, A. Koukoutsakis and E. Remiddi, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 627** (2002) 107, hep-ph/0112081; *Nucl. Phys.* B 642 (2002) 227, hep-ph/0206067.

[26] A. Vogt, *Phys. Lett.* B 497 (2001) 228, hep-ph/0010146.

[27] Y.L. Dokshitzer, A. Lucenti, G. Marchesini and G.P. Salam, *JHEP* **9801** (1998) 011, hep-ph/9801324; Y.L. Dokshitzer, G. Marchesini and G.P. Salam, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C 3** (1999) 1, hep-ph/9812487.

[28] Y.L. Dokshitzer, G. Marchesini and B.R. Webber, *JHEP* **9907** (1999) 012, hep-ph/9905339.

[29] A. Banfi, Y.L. Dokshitzer, G. Marchesini and G. Zanderighi, *JHEP* **0105** (2001) 040, hep-ph/0104162.

[30] M. Dasgupta, *J. Phys.* **G 28** (2002) 907, hep-ph/0109220; M. Dasgupta and G.P. Salam, *JHEP* **0208** (2002) 032, hep-ph/0208073.

[31] P.A. Movilla Fernandez, S. Bethke, O. Biebel and S. Kluth, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C 22** (2001) 1, hep-ex/0105059; E. Rodrigues, hep-ex/0205017.